

**REMARKS****I. Preliminary Remarks**

Applicants note that the Restriction Requirement mailed January 26, 2006 was forwarded to the former attorney of record. However, Revocation of Prior Power of Attorney, Associate Power of Attorney and Change of Correspondence Address documents were filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 25, 2005. A further copy of these documents is enclosed herewith. Please direct all future communications regarding this application to the undersigned.

**II. Explanation of Claim Amendments**

The new claims presented herein find support in the application as filed. New claims 31-33, 38-40, 50, 52-54, 56, and 60-66 correspond to original claims 1-3, 4-6, 8, 11-13, 14, and 24-30, respectively. The original claims have been presented as new claims in this amendment in order to organize the claims more conveniently. All new claims find support throughout the application as originally filed.

The chart set out below demonstrates the relationship of all claims to the original claims and indicates support for the new claims.

New Claims	Original Claims	Support found in application as filed
31.	1	Original claim 1
32.	2	Original claim 2
33.	3	Original claim 3
34.	NEW	Page 6, line 28
35.	7 (rewritten)	Page 4, line 17
36.	NEW	Page 6, line 29
37.	NEW	Page 6, line 28
38.	4	Original claim 4
39.	5	Original claim 5
40.	6	Original claim 6
41.	NEW	Page 11, line 25
42.	NEW	Page 5, line 14
43.	NEW	Page 4, line 17
44.	NEW	Page 4, line 18
45.	NEW	Page 4, line 20
46.	NEW	Page 4, line 21
47.	NEW	Page 6, line 3
48.	NEW	Table 1

New Claims	Original Claims	Support found in application as filed
49.	NEW	Page 7, line 12
50.	8	Original claim 8
51.	10 (rewritten)	Page 6, line 11
52.	11	Original claim 11
53.	12	Original claim 12
54.	13	Original claim 13
55.	10 (rewritten)	Page 6, line 15
56.	14	Original claim 14
57.	NEW	Page 12, line 5
58.	NEW	Page 12, line 5
59.	23 (rewritten)	Page 13, line 1
60.	24	Original claim 24
61.	25	Original claim 25
62.	26	Original claim 26
63.	27	Original claim 27
64.	28	Original claim 28
65.	29	Original claim 29
66.	30	Original claim 30

## II. Election in Response to the Restriction Requirement

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants hereby provisionally elect Group I drawn to a composition comprising A $\beta$  linked to an antibody *with traverse*. The claims submitted herewith that read on Group I include claims 31-50 and 57-66.

## III. Traversal of the Restriction Requirement

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement with respect to Groups I-IV because claim 31, directed to compositions comprising A $\beta$  polypeptide linked to non-A $\beta$  polypeptide (analogous to former claim 1), is a generic linking claim that links all of groups I-IV (directed respectively to non-A $\beta$  polypeptides that are antibodies, cytokines, enzymes, or leptin). Applicants also traverse the restriction requirement with respect to groups VI, VII (methods of treating and diagnosing) because they may properly be rejoined after allowance of composition claims from which the method claims depend.

The MPEP provides that when a patent application contains genus claims linking alleged patentably distinct species, the restriction requirement should acknowledge the existence of such claims, identify the the generic claim, identify the species claims, require election of a species, and examine the generic claim together with the species. See MPEP

809.02(a), which also states that: "Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim."

Each of Groups I-IV include generic claim 31 and are linked in that they are all directed to a composition comprising an A $\beta$  polypeptide linked to a non-A $\beta$  polypeptide. Thus, claim 31 and Groups I-IV should not be subject to a restriction requirement but rather should be examined together according to the usual practice for election of species.

Additionally, the examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Upon allowance of the elected product claims, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of the withdrawn process claims (claims 57-66) in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04.

In view of the remarks made above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the restriction requirement.

Dated: February 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Jeanne M. Brashear  
Jeanne M. Brashear

Registration No.: 56,301  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300  
Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300  
Agent for Applicant